

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 3-9, and 11-12 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-21 are pending and under consideration. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter and have been amended to address the concerns raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (US 7,178,106; “Lamkin”) in view of Otsuka et al. (US 2003/0044171; “Otsuka”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Both Lamkin and Otsuka fail to teaches or suggest that the informing and/or prohibiting of the informing occur when a first event and/or second event occur using first event information and/or second event information recorded in the markup document, as recited in claim 1. Neither Lamkin nor Otsuka teaches or suggests that the full-screen video mode is activated based on first event information and the full-screen video mode is not activated based on second event information recorded in the markup document.

Lamkin (col. 19, ln. 41-59) teaches only that the button disabling feature will always be present when the video is playing in full-screen mode, and the button enabling feature will always be present when the video is playing in a window within a web page.

In Otsuka, FIG. 3 teaches only the video menu disabling feature will always be present whenever the video is displayed in video mode and in the user agent mode. However, Lamkin and Otsuka do not teach or suggest that the button enabling/disabling feature can be triggered based on first event information and second event information included in the markup document.

Lamkin also does not expressly teach how the navigation buttons work or do not work for DVD navigation when video is playing in a window within a web page or when video is playing in full-screen mode. Otsuka also does not expressly teach that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation when video is displayed in video mode (full-screen mode) and in the user agent mode.

Claim 1 recites that the AV playback engine is being informed of the occurrence of the key input event by the ENAV engine when a first event occurs, and the AV playback engine is prohibited from being informed of the occurrence of the key input event by the ENAV engine when a second event occurs. Lamkin and Otsuka, on the other hand, merely teach that the navigation buttons do not work for DVD navigation (col. 19, ln. 51-54 in Lamkin; steps 312 and 314 in FIG. 3 of Otsuka), without teaching how this functionality is to be expressed. Neither Lamkin nor Otsuka considers the button enabling/disabling is caused by informing or prohibiting the informing of an occurrence of key input event corresponding to a user action by ENAV engine.

In addition, neither Lamkin nor Otsuka teaches that first event information and second event information are read by the ENAV engine when the AV data is reproduced in the interactive mode comprising a full mode and an embedded mode, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present invention recites that first event information and second event information are read by the ENAV engine when the AV data is reproduced in the interactive mode. Thus, in the present invention, when video is playing a full-screen mode or an embedded mode, and first event information is read by the ENAV engine, and first event information causes the ENAV engine to inform the AV playback engine of the occurrence of the key input event, thus navigation buttons do work.

The Office Action asserts that FIG. 3 of Otsuka teaches the feature that first event information and second event information are read by the ENAV engine when the AV data is reproduced in the interactive mode comprising a full mode and an embedded mode. In Otsuka, FIG. 3 and ¶¶ [0027]-[0029] (describing FIG. 3) teach that, if the specified mode is video mode, in step 312 the processor disables the video menu, and if the specified mode is the user agent mode, in step 314 the processor disables the video menu, too. In Otsuka, video menu can not be displayed and HTML menu can be displayed both in video mode and in user agent mode. In Otsuka, even if, *arguendo*, the video menu is taught in video mode and the user agent mode corresponds to the second event information of the present invention, Otsuka fails to teach first event information which causes the full-screen video mode to be activated because Otsuka does not teach that the video menu can be displayed in video mode and in user agent mode. Thus, Otsuka fails to teach first event information and second event information are read by the ENAV engine, when the AV data is reproduced in the interactive mode comprising a full mode and an embedded mode, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 12, 13, and 17 recite limitations similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 12, 13, and 17 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, and on their own merits. Since Lamkin and Otsuka do not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1, 12-13, and 17, claims 1, 12-13, and 17 are not obvious over the cited combination. Claims 3-9, 11, 14-16, and 18-21 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1, 13, and 17. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 12-21 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1, 3-4, 12-14, 17 have been amended to correct grammatical and typographical errors unrelated to any rejection in the Office Action, and should not require further consideration or search.

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 26, 2010

By: /Rachael Lea Leventhal/
Rachael Lea Leventhal
Reg. No. 54,266
NSIP Law
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 603
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 429-0020

RLL/